

## REMARKS

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 9-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 9, 10 and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

### **II. CLAIMS 24-27**

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 24-27 are allowed.

### **III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9-12 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) IN VIEW OF THE BROEKSTEEG PATENT**

Claims 9-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,066,236 to Broeksteeg (the "Broeksteeg" patent). Applicants respectfully submit that Broeksteeg does not anticipate claims 9-12 and 14 for at least the following reasons.

As regards the "single-layer stamped grid" recited in Applicants' claim 9, the Examiner apparently relies on the terminal lead frame 62 of the Broeksteeg patent. However, as is clear from the figures, in the Broeksteeg patent, the "counter contacts" are not at an angle relative to terminal lead frame 62. Said another way, the Broeksteeg patent does not disclose "wherein the counter-contact section forms a non-zero angle with the single-layer stamped grid," as recited in claim 9. For at least this reason. The Broeksteeg patent does not anticipate claim 9.

Claims 10-12 and 14 depend from claim 9. Accordingly, the Broeksteeg patent does not anticipated any of claims 10-12 and 14, for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 9.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 9-12 and 14 be withdrawn.

**IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9-14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) IN VIEW OF THE HILLBISH PATENT**

Claims 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,041,498 to Hillbish et al. (the "Hillbish patent"). It is respectfully submitted that the Hillbish patent does not anticipate any of claims 9-14, for at least the following reasons.

As regards the "single-layer stamped grid" recited in Applicants' claim 9, the Examiner apparently relies on first and second pieces 42 and 60 (Figs. 3, 4) of the Hillbish patent. Respectfully, like the Broeksteeg patent, the Hillbish patent also does not disclose "wherein the counter-contact section forms a non-zero angle with the single-layer stamped grid," as recited in claim 9. For at least this reason, the Hillbish patent does not anticipate claim 9. Claims 10-14 depend from claim 9, accordingly, the Hillbish patent does not anticipate any of these claims for at least the same reason.

In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 9-14 should be withdrawn.

**V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13 AND 23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 13 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Broeksteeg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,196,853 to Harting et al. (the "Harting" patent). Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Broeksteeg and Harting does not render obvious claims 13 and 23 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 13 depends from claim 9. Accordingly, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 9 apply equally to claim 13. Harting does not cure the deficiencies of the Broeksteeg patent.

Claim 23 depends from claim 15. As discussed below, the Examiner has not specifically rejected claim 15 in view of

prior art. In any event, like claim 9, claim 15 recites "wherein the counter-contact section forms a non-zero angle with the single-layer stamped grid." Thus, for at least the same reason discussed in connection with claim 9, this feature of claim 9 is not disclosed in the Broeksteeg patent. The Harting patent does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, the Broeksteeg patent in view of the Harging patent does not render claim 23 obvious.



**VI. CLAIMS 15-22**

Claims 15-22 have not been explicitly rejected by the Examiner, over prior art or otherwise. However, these claims are mentioned in connection with the rejection of claims 9-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Broeksteeg patent, and in connection with the rejection of claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Hillbush patent. In any event, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15-22 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by any of the prior art of record.

**VII. CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Dated: 4 Dec 2003

Respectfully submitted, (a no. 36088)  
  
By:   
Richard L. Mayer  
(Reg. No. 22,490)

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200